



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

relation it must be because there is *no other term* to which my judgment is related.

Now, lest I should be misunderstood by my pragmatist friends, let me hasten to explain that I have never for a moment believed that they were really solipsists, nor do I suppose that they seriously question my existence or each others'. I wish merely to point out that if one persists in holding to principles which are consistent only with solipsistic presuppositions, one can not get fully free from solipsism even by proclaiming upon the housetops one's enthusiastic adherence to the "social consciousness" view. It is all very well to insist that consciousness is social and public, and that self-consciousness arises only *pari passu* with consciousness of other selves. As Professor Moore points out, "My consciousness is a function of a social process in which my body or brain or mind is only one factor." This is all perfectly true. And yet, however interdependent our experiences may be, there is a sense in which my thought *is* private—*my* thought and not yours. As Professor James puts it, the breaches between "thoughts belonging to different personal minds . . . are the most absolute breaches in nature."⁴ And if I deny the existence of an unexperienced relation between my thought and your experience and the relevancy of this relation to the truth of my thought, I certainly seem so far forth to be denying your experience.

In all which I may be completely mistaken. And if I am, will not some kind pragmatist friend take pity on me, and explain to me at last the real nature of truth as applied to Peter's toothache?

JAMES BISSETT PRATT.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

REPLY TO PROFESSOR PRATT

SINCE Professor Pratt has failed to discover in my book, to which he courteously refers, anything relevant to his difficulties with Peter's toothache, I have little hope that he will find "help" in what I say here. This failure is symptomatic of the entire situation between Professor Pratt and the pragmatists. It means that Professor Pratt sees no connection between the origin, intent, and nature of ideas or judgment and the problem of truth. For the pragmatist the problem of the truth of ideas is bound up with that of their origin, nature, and intent. The result is that throughout the discussion the terms "idea," "judgment," "thinking," etc., mean one thing for the pragmatist and quite another for Professor Pratt. Hence each party seems to the other to be constantly begging the question. And it is futile to go on discussing the truth of ideas as if it were a per-

⁴"Psychology," p. 153.

fectly distinct and separate problem until we are agreed upon what an idea is. And if we were so agreed there would be little room left for disagreement about truth and error.

By "idea" and "judgment" Professor Pratt apparently means a "mental state" or "image" which through a relation "*not experienced by any of us human beings*" corresponds (or fails to correspond) to an object. (Italics mine.) For the pragmatist an idea or judgment is a form of interaction between beings that are *already* in some *other* (non-ideational, *e. g.*, instinctive, or perceptual) form of interaction which has fallen into conflict and uncertainty. To relieve this uncertainty the interaction assumes the reflective, judging form. For the pragmatist the entire origin, nature, intent, and verification of the judgment is defined with reference to this uncertainty in the already existing interactions. It is obvious that this kind of judgment does not require a relation "unexperienced by any of us mortals" to hitch it to its object. It emerges out of the *preceding* interaction already hitched to it. It is because John and Peter are already in some sort of interaction that John is capable of making any judgment whatever about Peter. If the relation between John's idea and Peter's pain is one outside the experience "of any of us human beings," how "on earth"—whatever it might do in this extra-human world—can John's idea aim at Peter at all?

So far as I can see, on Professor Pratt's view, if any one—sane or insane—should happen to have a mental image expressing itself in the words, "Peter Doe's eyes are green," and if, entirely apart from the origin and intent of this image, there happened to be somewhere, anywhere, in the universe, even beyond the experience "of any of us humans," a being with green eyes called by his co-beings "Peter Doe," we should have a judgment, according to Professor Pratt, and the judgment would be true. Now of course, as Professor H. W. Stuart has observed, there is nothing to prevent any one from cherishing this view of the judgment, if some sort of esthetic satisfaction is to be got from it; but what logical use is to be made of it is difficult to discover.

Proceeding with this notion of the judgment, Professor Pratt says that pragmatists have never met his difficulty of "a true but unverified judgment." And he might well have added, "And they can not meet it." They can not, that is, on its own terms. It is one of those surds which intellectualistic realism has in common with intellectualistic idealism and which the pragmatic movement "meets" by abolishing. It does this by finding that the judgment is an act *which includes verification in its intent*. Hence to submit the problem of "a true but unverified judgment" is, as Schiller says, to beg the whole issue. For the pragmatist no such case exists.

So, too, when Professor Pratt says that James and Schiller would deny him "the right to suppose, at the same time, a Tom with his idea and a Peter with his ache," he again overlooks the immense difference between his and James's and Schiller's conception of Tom's idea. What James and Schiller would deny is, not Tom with his idea, but Tom with *Professor Pratt's kind* of idea—*e. g.*, an idea consisting of an image whose relation to its object is "not experienced by any of us human beings," to say nothing of Tom.

Passing to the case of Peter, John, and Tom, Professor Pratt finds that in discussing, in my book, Peter's idea of his own ache, I have substituted "a perfectly new case" which "completely avoids all the difficulties" of the Peter-John and the Peter-John-Tom cases. Here I can only insist upon the identity in logical type, to which I called attention in a footnote, between Peter's judgment of his own ache and John's and Tom's judgments of it. Surely Peter is quite as likely to misdiagnose his own ache as is John or Tom—perhaps more so if John and Tom happen to be good physicians. Peter may think that a certain tooth is the cause of the ache, when it is not, just as John or Tom may think Peter has the toothache when he hasn't. Peter's difficulty and liability to error in judging his own ache are, in principle, just the same as John's and Tom's, and have to be met in the same way. Peter's ache and tooth are just as much (and as little) "realistically" related to his own ideas as to John's and Tom's.

If what I have just said about the identity in type of Peter's judgment about his own ache and John's and Tom's judgments about it holds, it ought to be sufficient to point Professor Pratt, in his difficulty with the latter, to the method which he admits works "so triumphantly" in the former. He would then find that there is no more difficulty with the opposed judgments of John and Tom, *provided they are taken pragmatically*, than with the different and opposed hypotheses which any one makes in his own mind in the course of an investigation. John's and Tom's judgments are but parts of a process of *interaction*, just as are the competing hypotheses in the thinking of any single investigator.

If Professor Pratt says: "But the judgments of John and Tom are not mere hypotheses; they are 'verified' judgments and John and Tom are 'satisfied' with them," the reply is: (1) these judgments are not "verified"—they are not even judgments unless they are expressions of uncertainty in interaction between John and Tom; (2) if they are such expressions and if the contradiction is *known* to John and Tom, obviously the verification and satisfaction can not be complete; (3) if the investigation of each is independent of and unknown to the other, even so, if John and Tom are good pragmatists, their "verification" and "satisfaction" will still be a "working"

verification and satisfaction, and as such will always be open to reconstruction. In other words, the difference between hypothesis and verification is again a relative—a “working” one. Hypothesis and verification are not absolute and exclusive qualities, but developmental stages of the judgment. The hypothetical judgment expresses the ambiguous and conflicting, the verified judgment the unified and definite *response*, to Peter’s actions. Verification marks the passage from the thinking, judging form of *response* to the stage of preparedness to act. If the response from the beginning is perfectly definite and unquestioned, then it is not, for the pragmatist, a judgment. It is simply some form of a direct, unreflective reaction.

Doubtless Professor Pratt will say, “Admitting the element of intent and response in the judgment, is not the intent of this response an intent to correspond to the object ‘as it really is?’” But just what does this mean? (1) The “correspondence” must stop short of identity with the object. It can not even pretend to “copy” it. This being the case, what *kind* of verification can it possibly have other than finding that when Peter is treated as having a toothache he responds (co-responds) in a certain way? Is not this all the correspondence and verification the idea expects or wants? And speaking of solipsism, would not a demand for the other sort of correspondence and verification mean a desire to *be* Peter’s toothache, and end in a complete absorption of Peter and finally of everything else into the idea? Does not a purely *intellectualistic* realism inevitably end in the same solipsism, and by the same token, in the same absolutism, as intellectualistic idealism? (2) “The object as it really is”—what is this? Is it the pain as it is for Peter, or as it is for John, or as it is in the interaction between Peter and John? The pragmatist’s answer is that the latter is what the object “really is” *in the judgment*. What it is for Peter alone may be just as “real”—only it is not *that* reality that is undergoing judgment.

Doubtless Professor Pratt will find that all this “shifts the ground.” And so it does. I see no way of meeting Professor Pratt’s difficulties “on their own ground.” And I wonder if Professor Pratt does. How does *he* settle the contradiction between John and Tom? For the experimental theory, these opposing judgments, *so long as they are opposed*, are still working hypotheses, and as such are subject to further experimentation. What are they for Professor Pratt? How does Professor Pratt decide between John and Tom? For let us remember that he can not here appeal to “what works.” That already stands condemned by his entire article. What then? The only passage in the above of Professor Pratt’s which bears on this is interesting. In answer to the ques-

tion, "How do you know that Peter has a toothache?" Professor Pratt says: "The answer is, I don't. I only suppose he has," and then he says, "You are bound to tell me how Tom's verified idea that Peter had no toothache was true, when *as a fact* [italics mine] Peter did have a toothache." Apparently Professor Pratt regards it as impossible to "know" whether Peter has the toothache, but easy to tell when "it is a fact."

A. W. MOORE.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

REVIEWS AND ABSTRACTS OF LITERATURE

The Direction of Desire: Suggestions for the Application of Psychology to Everyday Life. STANLEY M. BLYTH. London: Henry Frowde. 1910. Pp. xii + 360.

This book on "The Direction of Desire" addresses itself to those who have already an interest in such a discussion. Its nature and intention are frankly declared in the preface. "This book makes no claim to be scientific in the strict sense of the word. It aims chiefly at suggesting new lines of inquiry with regard to the alteration of the tone of consciousness, where that is desired. It is hoped that it may be found useful by those who have no time or inclination for reading longer and more serious works on psychology, but who at the same time have an interest, either for their own sake or for that of others, in investigating the possibilities of the human personality. . . . The object aimed at throughout has been to call attention to the possible uses of what has been named 'directive' psychology." (Preface, pp. iii and iv.)

Mr. Blyth feels himself to be a pioneer in the field of "directive" psychology, and in this character asks indulgence and cooperation of the readers of the book. "The facts upon which theories or principles in regard to the matters here discussed could be established with any high degree of probability have," he thinks, "yet to be collected. Perhaps a hope may be entertained that this book may lead to their being more accurately ascertained. . . . The personal experiences of those who may feel any interest in attaining self-direction, and in recording their efforts in regard to it, would, if obtainable, form the basis for a more complete and useful study of various problems which have been so roughly outlined in these pages." (Preface, p. iv.)

Of the difficulties which beset the path of a pioneer in such an undertaking Mr. Blyth is fully conscious. Directive psychology will, he recognizes, have to meet "all sorts of criticisms and objections. Perhaps the chief of these objections is the prejudice against self-experimentation in moral matters. The sacredness of the emotional life is held as a kind of dogma by many people with an intensity which is only equaled by its vagueness. . . . Our emotional nature is half consciously regarded as sent